

BELINDA K. AND J.H., HER MINOR SON,) Case No.: C 10-02507 LHK (PSG)
)
Plaintiffs,)
v.) **ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR A**
) **PROTECTIVE ORDER AND**
) **DENYING MOTION FOR**
YOLANDA BALDOVINOS, ET AL.,) **SANCTIONS**
)
Defendants.) **(Re: Docket No. 94)**
)

On December 1, 2010 and January 19, 2011, Defendant County of Alameda (the “County”) issued a number of subpoenas to Overton’s medical and mental health providers. On February 7, 2011, Overton moved to quash the subpoenas and for a protective order prohibiting the County from seeking his medical records. Overton also moved for sanctions for the cost of bringing motion. On February 22, 2011, the County filed a notice of non-opposition and withdrawal of the subpoenas. On March 11, 2011, the court granted Overton’s motion to quash. On March 15, 2011, the court held oral argument on Overton’s motion for protective order and motion for sanctions.

1 In response to Overton's argument that his medical and mental health records are irrelevant
2 to this action, the County has made no argument that Overton's records are relevant to this action.
3 As the County has not established the relevance of these records and did not oppose Overton's
4 motion either in the briefing or at oral argument, the court finds that Overton has shown good cause
5 for the requested protective order to avoid annoyance and undue burden. Thus, Overton's motion
6 for a protective order prohibiting the County from seeking his medical records is GRANTED.

7
8 Overton's motion for sanctions was included in the same moving papers as his motion to
9 quash and for a protective order. Under Civ. L.R. 7-8(a), any motion for sanctions must be
10 separately filed and the date for hearing must be set in conformance with Civil L.R. 7-2. Overton's
11 motion for sanctions is not in compliance with Civ. L.R. 7-8(a). The motion for sanctions therefore
12 is DENIED.

13
14 Dated: August 22, 2011



15
16 PAUL S. GREWAL
17 United States Magistrate Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28